



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/607,228	06/26/2003	Susan T. Dumais	MS160341.1 / MSFTP392US	5890
27195	7590	12/08/2005	EXAMINER	
AMIN & TUROCY, LLP 24TH FLOOR, NATIONAL CITY CENTER 1900 EAST NINTH STREET CLEVELAND, OH 44114			CHANNAVAJALA, SRIRAMA T	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2166	

DATE MAILED: 12/08/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/607,228

Applicant(s)

DUMAIS ET AL.

Examiner

Srirama Channavajjala

Art Unit

2166

– The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address –
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 26 June 2003.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-57 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-57 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|---|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date <u>10/11/05, 12/5/03</u> | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

1. Claims 1-57 pending in this application.

Drawings

2. The Drawings filed on 6/26/2003 are acceptable for examination purpose.

Information Disclosure Statement

3. The information disclosure statement filed on 10/11/2005, 12/05/2003 is in compliance with the provisions of 37 CFR 1.97, and has been considered and a copy is enclosed with this Office Action.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

(a) the invention was known or used by others in this country, or patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country, before the invention thereof by the applicant for a patent.

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

4. ***Claims 1, 27 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(a) as being anticipated by Rhodes, US Pub. No. 2003/0028631 filed on July 31, 2001, published on Feb 6, 2003.***

5. As to claim 1, Rhodes teaches a system which including 'a usage analyzer that determines user accessed items and a content analyzer that stores subsets data corresponding to the items, at least two of the items being associated with disparate

Art Unit: 2166

sources' [page 3, col 2, 0037, page 4, col 1, 0045, fig 1], user accessed items and content analyzer corresponds to Rhodes's fig 1, user ID as detailed in fig 4-5];

'an indexing component that indexes the data subsets' [page 5, col 2, 0058, fig 9], indexes the data subsets corresponds to Rhodes's fig 9, element 202 index array.

6. As to claim 27, Rhodes disclosed 'computer readable medium having computer readable instructions stored thereon for implementing at least one of the usage analyzer and an indexer' [page 9, col 2, line 23-25].

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

7. ***Claim 2, is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Rhodes, US Pub. No. 2003/0028631 filed on July 31, 2001, published on Feb 6, 2003 as applied to claim 1 above, and further in view of Hansen et al. [hereafter Hansen], US Pub. No. 2003/0014399 filed on March 12, 2002, published on Jan 16, 2003***

Art Unit: 2166

8. As to claim 2, Rhodes disclosed 'search component that in response to a search query, initiates a search across the indexed data' [page 4, col 1, 0045]. It is noted that Rhodes does not specifically teach 'outputs links to locations of a subset and/or sparse representation o the subset', although Rhodes specifically teaches network usage analysis system also including query as detailed in fig 1. On the other hand, Hansen et al disclosed outputs links to locations of a subset and/or sparse representation o the subset' page 5, col 1, 0049, line 1-4, 0050, line 8-9, col 2, line 1], Hansen specifically teaches search result including search session , as detailed in page 5, col 1, 0049.

It would have been obvious to one of the ordinary skill in the art at the time of applicant's invention to incorporate the teachings of Hansen et al. into network usage analysis system and method for updating statistical models of Rhodes because both Rhodes, Hansen both directed to internet, more specifically Rhodes is directed to usage analysis system as detailed in fig 1, while Hansen also directed to monitoring search, search path and search session using proxy log because proxy log including IP address associated with proxy user, a time stamp and logged event and requested web page [see Hansen: page 5, col 2, 0052] and both teach usage of internet data, particularly statistical analysis [see Rhodes: fig 1, element 34; Hansen: fig 6, element 622]..

One of the ordinary skill in the art at the time of applicant's invention to incorporate the teachings of Hansen et al. into network usage analysis system and method for updating statistical models of Rhodes because that would have allowed

Art Unit: 2166

users of Rhodes to not only search and access required web pages but also tracks users search session by the proxy log subset that including IP address, time stamp and associated event and like [see Hansen: page 5, col 2, 0052], thus improving monitoring user search activity and reusability as suggested by Hansen [page 3, col 2, 0026].

9. As to claim 3, Hansen disclosed 'local or remote data locations including files, folders, applications, images, audio files, appointments, email, and web information' page 3, col 1, 0020-0021, page 4, col 2, 0043], Hansen specifically teaches "yahoo" supports all the features for example files, folders, applications, images [page 5, col 1, 0049, line 5-6], audio files, appointments, emails and like.

10. As to claim 4, Hansen disclosed 'filter that extracts portions of the accessed items and creates sparse representations of accessed data in a content index' [page 5, col 1, 0045, line 1-4].

11. As to claim 5, Hansen disclosed 'indexer associates metadata with the accessed items, the metadata employed to retrieve the accessed items' [page 3, col 1, 0018].

12. As to claim 6, Hansen disclosed 'metadata includes at least one of a file path, a hyperlink and a tag' [page 5, col 1, 0050, line 4-9].

13. As to claim 7, Hansen disclosed 'an implicit query that is derived from the search query' [page 5, col 1, 0045, line 1-4].

14. As to claim 8, Hansen disclosed 'a gatherer component that specifies an interface to different content sources in their native format' [page 6, col 1, 0060].

15. As to claim 9-10, Hansen disclosed 'filter decodes individual file formats and emits a character stream for further processing' [page 6, col 1, 0062, line 1-5].

16. As to claim 11, Hansen disclosed 'processing includes at least one of date normalization and stemming' [page 5, col 2, 0052, line 4-6].

17. As to claim 12, Hansen disclosed 'query language for accessing stored information' [page 6, col 2, 0065, line 9-13].

18. As to claim 13, Hansen disclosed 'retriever component provides Boolean functions and best match retrieval on full text and metadata properties that enable at least one of phrase, wildcard and proximity searches' [page 5, col 2, 0050, line 1-5].

19. As to claim 14-15, Hansen disclosed 'protocol handler to extract individual messages from exchange mail stores, local mail files and public folders' page 5, 0050].

Art Unit: 2166

20. As to claim 16-17, Hansen disclosed 'event component that monitors user and makes determinations with respect to user actions' [page 5, col 2, 0052].

21. As to claim 18, Hansen evidential patterns of user activity including at least one of: a focus of attention, an introspection, an undesired piece of information, and a domain-specific syntactic and semantic content' [page 5, 0048, 0052].

22. As to claim 19-21, Hansen disclosed 'implicit queries based upon potential interest to a user' [page 5, col 2, 0053].

23. As to claim 22, Hansen disclosed 'uses to share selected electronic files with other users' [page 9, col 1, 0110].

24. As to claim 23, Hansen disclosed 'remove accessed ifnroamtin items' [page 5, col 1, 0049, line 8-13].

25. As to claim 24, both Rhodes, Hansen do not specifically disclose 'calendar items' It would have been obvious to one of the ordinary skill in the art at the time of applicant's invention to have calendar items during user submits search query because that would allowed users of Rhodes, Hansen specifically select calendar feature for example date, day and time to execute the search using search engines, thus able to maintain log in the proxy server and user session.

Art Unit: 2166

26. As to claim 25, Hansen disclosed 'perform background storage operations to processes volatile data' [page 3, col 2, 0028].

27. As to claim 26, Hansen disclosed, 'usage analyzer and the indexer is executed on at least one of a client machine and a server machine, the client and sever machines including at least one computer respectively' [see fig 7-8].

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

28. Claims 28-34 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Egendorf et al. [hereafter Egendorf], US Pub.No. 2003/0177111 A1 filed on Jan 21, 2003 [having continuation of application No. 09/441,270 filed on Nov 16, 1999], published on Sept 18, 2003.

29. As to claim 28, Egendorf teaches a system which including 'concurrent searching across a plurality of sources' [fig 1, Abstract];

'automatically determining whether a user has contemplated a data source

Art Unit: 2166

selected from at least two disparate data sources' [page 7, col 2, 0092, line 8-11, 0094, line 9-16, page 11, col 2, 0156, line 12-14], data sources corresponds to Egendorf's information sources fig 1, element 11A-11N;

'automatically indexing the contemplated data source in a computerized index' [page 12, col 2, 0175, fig 10].

30. As to claim 30, Egendorf disclosed 'at least one of explicit query options and implicit query options to access the computerized index' [page 12, 0176-0177].

31. As to claim 31, Egendor disclosed 'automatically updating a metadata file associated with the data source with at least one of explicit tag information and implicit tag information' [page 12, col 2, 0174, 0180, fig 3A-3B].

32. As to claim 32, Egendor disclosed 'file sharing option [page 12, col 2, 0173], a file scrubbing option , an effective time computation, and a background storage option' [page 8, col 2, 0099, line 18-21, page 9, col 2, 0111], file scrubbing allows to locate specific item of interest for example allows to jump specific portions in the screen graphics, audio, video with respect to control signals or timeline .

33. As to claim 33, Egendor disclosed 'automatically filtering the data source to create a sparse representation of the data source' [page 10, col 2, 0144, line 9-15].

Art Unit: 2166

34. As to claim 34, Egendor disclosed 'displaying at least one of a timeline visualization and grid visualization to represent queries derived from the computerized index' [page 11, col 1, 0148-0150, fig 3A-3B].

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

35. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(a) the invention was known or used by others in this country, or patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country, before the invention thereof by the applicant for a patent.

36. *Claims 35 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(a) as being anticipated by Grefenstette et al. [hereafter Grefenstette], US Patent No. 6446035 Published on Sept 3, 2002.*

37. As to claim 35, Grefenstette teaches a system which including 'means for determining when a user has accessed an information item' col 8, line 7-13, col 10, line 13-17, fig fig 5, element 306, fig 6, element 360], Grefenstette specifically teaches user ID, URL for the accessed web page including time stamp that indicating when particular user accessed information;

'means for filtering the information item' [col 13, line 28-36], filtering the information item corresponds to user entering the query using selected fields and query in field as detailed in fig 6;

'means for indexing the information item in a content index' [col 10, line 4-12],
Grefenstette specifically teaches indexing web pages corresponds to indexing
information item;

'means for querying the content index' [col 13, line 37-39].

**38. Claims 36-57 rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(a) as being anticipated by
Raboczi et al. [hereafter Roboczi], US Pub.No. 2003/0061209 filed on April 26,
2002, and published on March 27, 2003..**

39. As to claim 36, Raboczi teaches a system which including 'a user interface for
Computerized searching of data '[page 1, col 1, 0002], Raboczi directed to user
interface for navigation of information or searching information as detailed in page 1,
0002;

'a display having one or more display objects representing results gathered from
information items previously observed by a user' [page 2, 0024, page 3, col 2, 0046,
page 4, col 1, 0058, line 14-18, fig 2];

'at least one input option associated with the display to facilitate user queries of
the information items' [fig 5, page 5, col 2, 0084], Raboczi teaches search may be
narrowed or refined by specifying for example date range selection group element 88,
further this group includes two text boxes element 90 and 92 or text box 94 may be
used to enter dates that corresponds to at least one input option associated with the
display to facilitate user queries.

Art Unit: 2166

40. As to claim 37, Raboczi disclosed 'queries are launched when filtering objects in the user interface are manipulated or when the user selects return' [page 5, col 2, 0087, page 6, col 1, 0089, line 3-5].

41. As to claim 38, Raboczi disclosed 'a list view interface' [page 5, col 2, 0089], Raboczi specifically teaches hierarchical menu control element 130.

42. As to claim 39, Raboczi disclosed 'a preview showing a portion of a message' [page 5, col 2, 0087, line 4-7].

43. As to claim 40, Raboczi disclosed 'at least one of a document title, a date, a rank, an author, mail to field, a file type field, a mail CC field, a mail has attachment field, a message type, a message read field, a path, a size and a title' [page 2, col 2, 0027, line 5-8, page 5, col 1, 0069, page 6, col 1, fig 7, 0092].

44. As to claim 41, Raboczi disclosed 'display objects further comprise user selectable filters' [page 5, col 1, 0071].

45. As to claim 42, Raboczi disclosed 'options for adding custom metadata to items' [page 5, col 1, 0072, 0077, fig 4].

Art Unit: 2166

46. As to claim 43, Raboczi disclosed 'options to supply usage-based metadata that is generated from user events' [page 5, col 2, 0079].

47. As to claim 44, Raboczi disclosed 'a persistent query that is associated with a local or remote content source, and summary information presented to the user relating to the query' [page 3, col 1, 0045-0046, 0052].

48. As to claim 45, 47, Raboczi disclosed 'display further comprising a timeline visualization of the display objects' [page 3, col 2, 0049, fig 3 page 5, 0082].

49. As to claim 46, Raboczi disclosed 'timeline visualization includes an annotation of at least one of a public event and a personal event to facilitate searching results-related information' [page 5, col 1, 0068, col 2, 0082].

50. As to claim 48, Raboczi disclosed 'grid visualization enables users to explore trends, correlations, and relationships in a large information set' [page 4, col 2, 0064, 0067].

51. As to claim 49, Raboczi disclosed 'visualization employs a grid motif to show relationships between attributes of people, topics, and time, wherein uses assign one of the attributes to an X axis and another attribute to a Y axis' [page 4, 0068, page 6, col 2, 0106].

52. As to claim 50-51, Raboczi disclosed 'present information about items that have been accessed by multiple people in an organization, shared via the merging of multiple indices or via the indexing of coalesced content' [page 6, 0108, fig 9A-9C].

53. As to claim 52, Raboczi disclosed 'virtual folders that contain results of predefined, or persistent queries, including queries that have, as part of their definition, temporal or organizational relationships' [page 3, col 1, 0046].

54. As to claim 53, Raboczi disclosed 'a hierarchy of nested sets of folders of increasing specialization that are invoked to represent the results of queries with increasingly specialization' [page 3, col 2, 0047, page 6, col 2, 0106].

55. As to claim 54, Raboczi disclosed 'a component to submit a query or an automatically reformulated version of the query to at least one other search engine' [page 1, col 2, 0013].

56. As to claim 55,-57, Raboczi disclosed 'a component for accessing resources from the internet [page 3, col 1, 0045, line 8-10], and integrating query results from a personal search engine with results from the other search engine in a displayed result list' [page 5, 0069].

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

57. Claim 29, is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Egendorf et al. [hereafter Egendorf], US Pub.No. 2003/0177111 A1 filed on Jan 21, 2003 [having continuation of application No. 09/441,270 filed on Nov 16, 1999], published on Sept 18, 2003 as applied to claim 28 above, and further in view of Singer et al. [hereafter Singer], US Patent NO. 6789115

As to claim 29, Egendorf does not specifically teach 'automatically monitoring the user and automatically analyzing the data source to determine whether the user has contemplated the data source', although Egendorf disclosed user searching multiple data sources as detailed in fig , Abstract. On the other hand, automatically monitoring the user and automatically analyzing the data source to determine whether the user has contemplated the data source' [Abstract, fig 1-2,col 4, line 30-67].

It would have been obvious to one of the ordinary skill in the art at the time of applicant's invention to incorporate the teachings of Singer et al. into searching from a

Art Unit: 2166

plurality of data sources of Egendorf et al. because both Singer and Egendorf are directed to accessing, querying network, more specifically, Egendorf is directed to identifying multiple information sources, and retrieving information from information sources [see Abstract, fig 1], while Singer is directed to capturing, analyzing, storing, reporting user's usage of multiple web servers from Internet [see Abstract], both Egendorf, Singer teach Internet information sources [Egendorf: fig 1; Singer: fig 1], further both Egendorf and Singer teach querying [Egendorf: page 12, col 1, 0166; Singer: col 6, line 5-6].

One of the ordinary skill in the art at the time of applicant's invention to incorporate the teachings of Singer et al. into searching from a plurality of data sources of Egendorf et al. because that would have allowed users of Egendorf to incorporate collection of user usage data from internet, more specifically, filtering program for user to track "log records" that automatically collects, captures and analyzes from multiple internet or web servers on daily or time of day set for the process, thus bringing the advantages of minimizing the use of system resources, automatically deleting unwanted information and increasing efficiency of system resources as suggested by Singer [col 2, line 11-14, line 47-48].

Conclusion


The prior art made of record

- | | | |
|----|----------------|--------------|
| a. | US Pub. No. | 2003/0061209 |
| b. | US Pub.No. | 2003/0177111 |
| c. | US Patent No. | 6789115 |
| d. | US Pub.No. | 2003/0028631 |
| e. | US Pub.No. | 2003/0014399 |
| f. | U.S.Patent No. | 6446035 |

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Srirama Channavajjala whose telephone number is 571-272-4108. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday from 8:00 AM to 5:30 PM Eastern Time.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Alam, Hosain, T, can be reached on (571) 272-3978. The fax phone numbers for the organization where the application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300 Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free)

SC
Patent Examiner.
December 5, 2005.


SRIRAMA CHANNAVAJJALA
PRIMARY EXAMINER